

Abdul Rafay vs. Ali Sina Part 1

Abdul Rafay vs. Ali Sina Part 1

The Absurdity of Allah

2006/09/05

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2006 15:52:30 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Abdul Rafay" rafayshah@yahoo.com View Contact Details Add Mobile Alert
Subject: A simple observation... and a simple challenge
To Ali Sina

I read your challenge. I read debates. I read the way you are after it.

I smiled.

I come up with a totally new resolution that might not interest you because it is based on simple logics and obvious truth. Yet, it is my duty to stimulate you whether or not you respond.

Dear Mr. Abdur Rafay:

I read your messages in [this thread](#). I am sorry that I did not read your email. Doubtless kindly responds to all the emails sent to FFI and if he thinks there is one that I should see he tags it for me. Your email was not tagged and so I did not notice it. Anyway, you seem to be a knowledgeable Muslim and I will be glad to debate with you. You wrote:

1. Your so-called challenge is based on RANDOM PICKS aimed to irritate Muslims only (a game you seem to intend to play with human psychology only and not to actually try to reach the truth) This is your first failure on claiming yourself to be based on strong logical grounds. I mean, you would actually be logical if your first challenge was against the existence of God. (You rather target Muhammad (pbuh)) proving yourself more IRRITATED than HAVING FOUND THE TRUTH. For example, if Mr.A says "The fish in the Atlantic are dying!!! the water is polluted!!!" the claim is lame as Mr.A did not go for testing the water of the Atlantic. Sounds far fetched? Ok... go for this one... Mr.B enters a house and tries to drag someone out of the house and on resistance, he beats him severely. Mr.A says B was a criminal and intruder.... Mr.A is fool if Mr.B is from FBI and holds the authority.... Therefore the point is in finding out if Mr.B is actually from FBI and is obeying the law and not what Mr.B is doing. So when you say "Muhammad did this... Muhammad did that..." I can see no point against the concept of the existence of God ... just some frustration in the tone of the speaker... This is because it was not only Muhammad (pbuh) who identified God. The existence of God remains unaffected regardless of what Muhammad or anyone else does. What I want to say is, "If your target is Muhammad only, you are illogical when to talk against the existence of God. If your target is God only, Talking about Muhammad pulls you down to such a low level (Muhammad is just a prophet). If your target is BOTH... come on in the right order. Once the existence of God has been proven, proving the status of Muhammad (pbuh) will be the very next step." SO... your present challenge is not a challenge at all (if you surpass the debate on the existence of God

Our goal in FFI is not to prove that God does not exist. Of course we talk about many subjects and I have spoken about God as well. However, this is not the objective of our site. The objective of FFI is to prove that Muhammad was a liar and not a prophet of any god, whatever that god may be.

2. Most of the the stuff you have collected in your ATTEMPT to prove Islam wrong is EXAMPLES of unfaithful Muslims (While surfing through your sight, I clearly observed that your primary target it Muslims and not Islam... Don't tell me that 'it is Muslims who make up Islam'... You don't sound like a child. I hope you understand that Muslims' actions do not affect the authenticity of Islam... Like the Americans' wrongdoings don't mean that the legislature is wrong). Movie clips, news about Muslims, blah blah blah... Sounds like you are rather scared of Islam and want to show it down one way or the other... by hooks or by crooks... Sorry, not that easy! Challenge Islam and not the Muslims to get a good refutation.....

I am afraid you did not pay enough attention to the real message of this site. Here we are attacking Muhammad and not Muslims. We quote the Quran, the Hadith and the Sira to prove our case against Muhammad and Islam. Of course, Muslims commit these crimes against humanity because they are inspired by sunna and the Quran. So the evil comes from them but this evil originates from Muhammad.

3. You challenged Dr. Zakir Naik? Are you telling me that you would call a surgeon busy in an operation theater from behind and say, "So is that your mastery? Scissors and forceps and the ailment is out? If you really dare, come to my pharmacy, use my medicine and show me how you tug that tumor out!!!" I'm still smiling... To challenge a surgeon, you need to go to his circumstances.... But if you want to call him to yours, wait for his challenge and stop beating your chest in a fools' victory... You will need a CPR later when you talk to me... not now.

As far as Dr. Naik is concerned I have already proven that he is wrong on every account. If you disagree, please show my errors. Please remember that this is not about Dr. Naik but about Islam. It is every Muslim's duty to respond and show that I am mistaken. Dr. Naik is not going to respond. He knows that he has been caught with "his pants down" and his tricks are fully revealed. He is not going to humiliate himself trying to refute the irrefutable. However, I invite you or any Muslim to refute what I said.

I am not defending Islam.... I want to reach the TRUTH... wherever it is.
My challenge is that on the basis of logic, I can prove the existence of God.
Waiting for your response.

Suppose you prove the existence of God, this does not prove that Muhammad was his prophet. However, since you seem to have such a big interest on this subject, let us start with God.

Let us go over what you wrote on this subject in the forum.

Theodore M. Drange charges God of claiming to have a certain qualities at the same time, which according to him are opposite to each other and no one can have them all together.

He writes:

10. The Justice-vs.-Mercy Argument

The last argument to be considered in this survey pits property (j) against property (k). It may be formulated as follows:

1. If God exists, then he is an all-just judge.
2. If God exists, then he is an all-merciful judge.
3. An all-just judge treats every offender with exactly the severity that he/she deserves.
4. An all-merciful judge treats every offender with less severity than he/she deserves.
5. It is impossible to treat an offender both with exactly the severity that he/she deserves and also with less severity than he/she deserves.
6. Hence, it is impossible for an all-just judge to be an all-merciful judge (from 3-5).
7. Therefore, it is impossible for God to exist (from 1, 2, and 6).

I say:

Theodore M. Drange has clearly formed a DEFENSIVE point by misstating that God is all-merciful and all-just at the same time. The Arabic word "ArRahman" does not mean all-merciful, but "the merciful one" and the word "AlAdl" means, "the just one". One might say "All the same...". Not exactly. There is no element of entirety in these meanings allowing both the qualities to be present in One at the same time. Now the remaining question is "How can someone be both just and merciful at the same time?". Simple. Just means according to Dictionary.Com:

1. guided by truth, reason, justice, and fairness: We hope to be just in our understanding of such difficult situations.
2. done or made according to principle; equitable; proper: a just reply.
3. based on right; rightful; lawful: a just claim.
4. in keeping with truth or fact; true; correct: a just analysis.
5. given or awarded rightly; deserved, as a sentence, punishment, or reward: a just penalty.
6. in accordance with standards or requirements; proper or right: just proportions.
7. (esp. in Biblical use) righteous.
8. actual, real, or genuine.

Meaning #5, 6 and 7 apply to the current case to define the Arabic version of the word precisely. This combination refers to the quality of GIVING in right proportions, to the righteous and deserving. Now for example, A is a good man and B is a bad man. A has done mistakes and has shown redemption while B has been stubborn. Now the principle of justice requires both to be punished at various degrees. Suppose A deserves 10% punishment while B deserves 20% punishment. Now mercy forces the judge to punish A at only 05%, but at the same time, B gets a 20% punishment which is against the principle of justice. So "the just one" and "the merciful one" has the option to punish B by

only 10% maintaining a ratio of 1:2 by the principle of justice and reducing the punishment of both by the principle of mercy.

There may now be a question that if B deserved 20% punishment, why was it reduced? Is it not against the principle of justice? The answer is no. Because the Arabic word "Adl" refers to justice that distributes something in two halves which includes at least two people. So it is relative, not independent.

If there is any answer to this explanation, I welcome, otherwise, the charge must be removed.

Your response to Theodore makes sense. You say since God reduces the punishment of all the sinners in equal proportion, there is no injustice done to anyone. Since everyone benefits from his mercy equally, no one is unfairly treated and this is justice.

Very well. However, according to Islam sins are of two kinds: Sins committed against God, such as disbelieving in him, not worshipping him, escaping from the battlefield during Jihad, etc. and sins committed against fellow humans such as murder, theft, abuse, etc.

My first question is about sins committed against other humans. Does God have the right to forgive those who committed sins against other humans? Certainly not! That would be injustice to the victims. Suppose I kill you. Justice demands that I should be punished accordingly. Only you are entitled to decide whether I should be forgiven or not or whether there should be a reduction in my punishment. If God reduces my punishment or forgives me without your consent, it is injustice to you. So in this case God cannot be just and merciful at the same time. To the degree that he is merciful to the offender, he is unjust to the victim.

The second question is about sins committed against God. The Quran says that Allah will forgive all sins except the sin of associating partners to him. (4:48) This is unjust. First of all how can he forgive mass murderers who brought so much pain to countless people and not forgive one who simply thinks Muhammad was a nutcase? Where is the justice here? Secondly, no human should be punished for disbelief. Why? Because we never agreed to believe in God and worship him when we were given life. As far as I know everyone cries when he comes to the world. We are here without our will. God cannot impose on us obligations that we never agreed to. This is like I drag you and force you into my house without your consent while you are crying, then demand gratitude and payment from you for staying in my home and torture you if you fail to pay. This is not justice. The Mullahs in Iran did just that. They imprisoned and then executed their detractors and made their families pay for the food they served them in jail and even bullets used to kill them. This is not justice and not befitting for a real God. Assuming this world is such a wonderful place to be, which many disagree, no one must thank God for being here because we have been forced to live in this prison called life. We did not ask for it and should not be required to thank anyone for what we did not want to begin with.

Thanking God should be an entirely personal matter. Those whose life is full of blessing and joy may choose to thank God and those who don't want to thank him should not be punished for it because they never asked to be born in the first place. Therefore punishing people for disbelief is patent injustice. To add insult to injury, if you become fed up of your life and decide to end it, you will surely be sent to hell to burn for eternity. This is the maximum form of abuse.

Thanking must always be voluntary. If it becomes obligatory it is no longer heartfelt. A despot may enjoy seeing his subjects bow in front of him, but do they really love him? Love can never be forced on people. To say love me or I will torture you is sick. Is Allah a psychopath?

Again, Theodore writes:

1. The Perfection-vs.-Creation Argument

Consider the pair a-I, which takes God to be perfect and also to be the creator of the universe. It seems that those properties might be shown to be incompatible in two different ways. The first way is as follows:

Version 1

1. If God exists, then he is perfect.[2]
2. If God exists, then he is the creator of the universe.
3. A perfect being can have no needs or wants.
4. If any being created the universe, then he must have had some need or want.
5. Therefore, it is impossible for a perfect being to be the creator of the universe (from 3 and 4).
6. Hence, it is impossible for God to exist (from 1, 2, and 5).

Premise 3 might be challenged on the grounds that a perfect being, full of love, could desire to share his love with others. Thus, a perfect being could have a want, which would make premise 3 false. I suppose the only problem with this is that, if a being wants something that he does not have, then he cannot be perfect, for he would be in a certain way incomplete. Whether or not this adequately defends premise 3 is hard to say. There is a certain unclarity, and perhaps subjectivity, in the idea of "perfection" which poses an obstacle to any sort of rigorous reasoning about the concept.[3]

Premise 4 might also be challenged. Perhaps God created the universe accidentally. For example, he "slipped and fell," thereby creating a mess, which turned out to be our universe. In that case, God would not have had any need or want in creating the universe, and premise 4 would be false. There are difficulties with this, however. First, almost every theist who takes God to have created the universe takes it to have been done deliberately, not accidentally. And second, if the creation were accidental, then that in itself would imply that God is imperfect (since perfect beings do not have accidents), and that would be another basis for the Perfection-vs.-Creation Argument. Thus, this sort of challenge to premise 4 itself runs into problems.

I say:

God's one other attribute is that He is alive. According to Ali Sina, existences such as love, hatred, anger, fear, want and so on are all the functions of life. Therefore, God is supposed to be the resource of all of these being a creator. The quality of God, Theodore is trying to highlight here, is given by the Arabic term, "As-Samad", which means "the one who needs nothing" precisely, and not "desireless". This is to say that God needs nothing. And that God is perfectly powerful. So He can do anything He wants. So want is inevitable as in Quraan, Allah says at various instances, the phrases "illa maa shaa Allah" (But what Allah wants) and "wa lau shaa Allahu" (And if Allah desires). Now the error in Mr. Theodore's analogy is that he has placed an open supposition. This means that since the debate is whether there IS a God or NOT, the phrase "perfect being" is wrong because there are two ends of perfection. For example, in economics, you regard demand as either perfectly elastic or perfectly inelastic or something in between. Similarly, when it comes to a being, it is either perfectly alive or perfectly dead, or something in between. Theodore's supposition would be true for a god who was perfectly dead.... No emotions, no wants, no love, no desires.... Simply no god! But our claim is

that God is perfectly alive. Therefore He is the resource of all that alive beings can have... love, want, power to fulfill His wants and do whatever he wills... Hence there is creation.

Please refute if you can, or remove Theodore's article.

You made good reasoning. However you overlooked the fact that the god of Islam did not create the world out of love but out of need. Allah in the Quran says: "*I have only created Jinns and men, that they may serve Me.*" 51:56 Why Allah needs to be served if he is needless? It is very clear that Allah is a needy god. In fact his needs are so intense that if someone does not serve him he would punish that person for eternity in the cruelest way imaginable. This is the highest form of abuse. Humans are brought to this world without their will. Most of them suffer pains and sorrows most of their lives and on top of that they have to thank, worship and serve the one who is responsible for their miseries?

Justice dictates that punishment should be proportionate to the offence. It is not justice to torture a person for life for stealing an apple. Assuming that disbelief is a crime, which is absurd, why should such a trivial offence be punished in such a severe way? Why is Allah hurt so much if we do not worship him to the extent that he would heartlessly burn us in such a sadistic way for eternity? This punishment outweighs the crime infinitely. How can we call such a sadistic deity just?

If there are no other gods but Allah why is he so desperate and jealous? I can be jealous if my wife looks at men better looking than me. This would be sick but understandable. I may have low self esteem. However, if we live in an island where there are no men at all, and still I am jealous, I should be sent to a mental hospital at once. How can Allah be jealous of gods that do not exist? Is Allah insane? No, the answer is that Muhammad was insane. It is a tragedy that a billion people worship the figment of the imagination of a mentally deranged man.

I am much kinder to my cat than God is to me. I feed my cat, take care of him, take him to the vet if he gets sick, wash him and groom him and I never think of punishing him if he does not pay attention to me. As a matter of fact my cat thinks he owns the house and I am his servant. He owes his entire existence to me. Without my care and protection he will not survive. Despite that he never thanks me and I still love him. Let us say God created me. But he does not take care of me. I am left in this world to fend for myself. I have faced calamities that could have been avoided if God was looking over my shoulders. I would die of hunger if I do not earn my own bread. Tens of thousands of children die every day of hunger. Where is this loving god to come to their rescue? He is nowhere to be found when we are in need. Our prayers and supplications are never heard. I am by all means kinder to my cat than God is to me. And yet I can love my cat unconditionally without wanting him to worship me or thank me. God is incapable of loving his creation unconditionally. He put us in this world without consulting us. Here we have to face life with all its difficulties and pains on our own. He takes away our loved ones and fills our hearts with great sorrow. He shatters our hopes.

He sends one calamity after another and kills innocent people by thousands and despite all that he wants us to worship him and serve him. Why should we thank such a god? What do we owe him? We owe him nothing! He does not deserve our respect. Such a needy, petulant and abusive god deserves our scorn. The god of Muhammad is sick. He is a psychopath.

The truth is that Allah is Muhammad's own alter ego. He is everything the narcissist Muhammad wanted to be. He does what he pleases and he responds to no authority above him. He wants to be worshipped, obeyed and feared. This is the wet dream of all narcissists. One must be naïve to believe that the maker of this universe is this insane god described by Muhammad. Why would one who owns this magnificent universe care if a bunch of evolved apes in this tiny plant worship him or not? Can we really hurt the feelings of the maker of this vast universe by simply disbelieving in him? There are many holes in the concept of god as defined by the illiterate self-proclaimed prophet of Arabia.

This is not to say that God does not exist. I am not a materialist. I believe God is the Principle underlying all things. God is a non-being and this non-being is the mother all beings. God is an immutable eternal law without which nothing can exist. All I want to prove is that Muhammad was indeed an ignorant man who had no understanding of God whatsoever. Attributing human qualities to God is utmost ignorance. To say God is just, merciful or compassionate is stupid. How can an indefinable and incomprehensible reality have human attributes? God is beyond good and bad. God is not a thing and as such It can have no attributes. Only things have attributes. Principles do not have attributes. God cannot be living because life is a function of beings. God is not a being. It is not made of anything - not of matter and not of spirit. It has no essence, no substance. God is HOW. How things are made, how the universe works, how life comes to be and how it ends. God is HOW and everything else is WHAT. That is all there is - HOW and WHAT.

Muhammad was an ignorant man. Allah was a Pagan deity, invented by very primitive people. These people thought that the highest expression of power is despotism. So the qualities that they attributed to their gods were those of a despot. Muhammad, being a narcissist, loved to impersonate this despot and become a god or his sole intermediary. Becoming godlike is the wet dream of every narcissist. That is why Muhammad's Allah is capricious, arbitrary, willful and wanton. The concept of Allah is utterly stupid. It is not befitting for rational people in this day and age to believe in such a primitive deity.

God is not "he" but "it". Attributing gender to God is humanizing It and this is sheer ignorance of the nature of God. God is not the creator of the universe but the law of creation. God does not love. It does not create. It does nothing at all. Doing, subjects the doer to time. Without time no action can take place. God can't be subjected to time because It is beyond time and space. It is a logical absurdity to say that God is the creator. God is the law that gives order to the universe and makes it run. God is manifest in every atom, in every minute particle forming this universe and wherever there is order. And yet It is nowhere to be found. God is not a person, not a being, not a thing. It is the Principle underlying all things. It is a reality, the ultimate Reality.

